

FREUDGATE '09 *PASSION FOR* *MURDER In The Light Of New Facts: Part 2 Eric Miller*

THE TRUTH ASSAULTED: THE FREUDIAN PROPAGANDA OF DR. JEFFERY MASSON

By Eric Miller© 7/2009

In March of 1985, the "complete and unexpurgated" personal correspondence between Dr. Sigmund Freud and Dr. Wilhelm Fliess was published by Harvard University press, edited by Dr. Jeffery Masson. Since the published correspondence does not include (with one exception) photo copies of Freud's original letters, its value as a scholarly work is highly questionable. All other previous "authorized" editions of this collection of letters are provably fraudulent and, especially in the view of the history of the massive corruptions of Freud's work, no sincere scholar can accept a new edition on blind faith without independent corroboration with original source material. Another fact adding a serious note of caution regarding the Freud/Fliess correspondence is that the General Editor of this Harvard edition, Jeffery Masson, has himself been active in the corruption and suppression of Freud's

original correspondence -- the very letters, in fact, over which he once exercised general editorship.

The issue is a matter of importance which extends beyond a narrow scholarly interest in Freud's work. A host of important matters are involved bearing on the intellectual integrity of powerful and influential organizations and people. Abuse of the public trust and misuse of American government is at stake. The following comments provide a brief background of the newest "Freud controversy" and offers indisputable evidence of the continuing conspiracy to hide the *real* Dr. Sigmund Freud from public discovery. As with the Nixon debacle, the crime of the suppression of the truth is not the central issue, but the shady realities which necessitated the suppression in the first place.

Background to the Controversy

In 1984, Dr. Jeffery Masson, a Freudian psychoanalyst, published a book certain to create a national and international sensation. Indeed, even prior to publication of his book, through a series of lectures, articles, and interviews, Masson had already become a *cause célèbre*. His views were widely disseminated and advertised in an explosive series of articles in the New York Times and elsewhere. In these interviews Masson released excerpts from Freud's previously unpublished letters, the contents of which had been kept completely secret from historians and Freud scholars alike. Cover stories by or about Masson were featured in national magazines such as "Discovery," "Mother Jones," and "Atlantic Monthly." A sensational two part series on Masson and his work appeared in the New Yorker Magazine - an event which triggered Masson filing a \$10 Million law suit charging the magazine with misrepresenting the views of Masson and maligning his reputation. The court found against Masson.

Newspaper articles appeared in the Los Angeles Times, the San Francisco Herald, and other metropolitan newspapers. Highly prominent psychoanalysts, psycho-therapists and psychiatrists intensified Masson's publicity by attacking him in the press. Masson was branded as a traitor to the "cause" of psychoanalysis, a

rebel in the ranks, a turncoat, and a rake. Masson, it was asserted, was making a mountain out of a molehill. Criticisms against Freud have come and gone before, they noted, and Masson's critique was predicted to be no exception. For his part, Masson counterattacked the icy rejection of the importance of his work by branding his critics fools, incompetents, and deluded -- "true believers" ignorant of the true genesis and history of Freud's ideas. After all, Masson retorted, Anna Freud herself had picked him to prepare the complete unexpurgated edition of Freud's personal correspondence, not them. It was himself, not them, who had read Freud's own words and knew what Freud really thought and said. None of them, Masson could correctly claim, had ever seen, with their own eyes, what Freud had actually written in his private letters -- private letters whose possible disclosure horrified Freud.

But what is the furor all about? What is the basis of the Masson/Establishment controversy? What are Masson's main ideas and why are his views so upsetting to the professional guilds? The San Francisco Herald characterized the controversy in this way:

Jeffery Masson, until recently heir apparent to the prestigious job of director of the Sigmund Freud Archives, has rocked the Freudian establishment with his charges in his book, "The Assault on

Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory," that the Father of Psychoanalysis made serious errors of ethical and scientific judgment that call into question the validity of all of Freudian analysis.

Masson's thesis is essentially this: Freud was guilty of intellectual "cowardice." To insinuate himself to the medical establishment of Vienna, Freud renounced the early foundation concept of his theories, and, by a mistaken route, arrived at the Oedipus complex theory.

The criticism that Freud was wrong in his conception of the Oedipus complex, however, is not new. Numerous critics have made the same charge innumerable times before. What is sensational is that Masson's critique comes on the heels of his revelation that the "official" version of Freud's intellectual history is, in effect, a forgery. Anna Freud and her editorial collaborators, with calculated omissions and studied mistranslations, systematically concocted a deceitful history of the origins and evolution of Freud's fundamental theories. In doing so, they hoped to avoid attention being drawn to certain personal facts of Freud's life which intimately influenced his own rejection of his own so-called foundation concepts and theories; -- facts which necessitated the creation of a smoke screen of fraud by Freud's faithful followers lest the truth totally destroy

his carefully promoted reputation.

Masson's publicized disclosure of the facts surrounding the translation corruption of Freud's letters by Anna Freud and other prominent Freudian's has stimulated recent cries of protest from many quarters of the professional and public sectors. The *Los Angeles Times*, for instance, published an editorial castigating the corruptions of Freud's translators:

Intertwined with the intellectual dispute about the true nature of Freud and Freudianism is (who will be surprised?) the question of ownership -- the control of the unpublished papers of Freud and his circle. There are lots and lots of them, reposing, as it happens, in the Library of Congress. Here is where the professional controversy becomes a matter of public interest. For the great bulk of those papers - papers that may answer some unanswered questions about Freud, papers that will shed light on the intentions of the great man whose theories influence the thoughts, and lives, of millions of men, women and children - are not to be published for many years, some not until 2102. The Eleusinian mysteries were not more carefully

guarded.

It is, in a word, a scandal. It is a scandal to science and a scandal to history. (*Dec. 28, 1983*)

Voices throughout the land began clamoring for release of the secret Freud letters and a lifting of the embargo imposed on the letters by Anna Freud and consented to by the Library of Congress. Support for a public investigation into this "scandal" of science and history is gaining momentum and is being heard on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. The distinguished Professor Eysenck wrote in 1984:

The fact that such an embargo was put on this correspondence suggests that there was something to hide, and Freud's family has done a great deal of harm to his reputation by insisting on this form of censorship which goes counter to all scientific integrity. It is to be hoped that the publication of this book [ed. this is a reference to E.M. Thornton's book *Freud & Cocaine* being reviewed by Eysenck, published in the U.S. as *The Freudian Fallacy*] will persuade the family to release the correspondence, and make it possible in this way for honest critics to

examine in detail the original data which alone can finally settle these and many other questions.

The issue of "Child Molestation" & Freud's "Intellectual Cowardice."

To get a general perspective on the issues involved in the recent controversy it should be noted that during the early years in the development of psychoanalysis, Freud believed that serious neurotic afflictions were "invariably" caused by sexual molestation occurring in childhood or infancy, usually by the father. Then, sometime in 1897, Freud changed his mind. Rather than continuing to publicize his belief in the reality of sexual assaults in childhood, Freud abandoned the subject altogether and by 1905, publicly renounced his early theories. He admitted that the stories (which he had believed) of sexual attacks in infancy and childhood told him by his patients were, in fact, lies and "phantasies," products of his patient's diseased imaginations. As we shall soon see these diseased imaginings were actually Freud's own, not his patients.

Masson holds the view that Freud was wrong to deny the "evidence" which he accumulated and believed. In Masson's opinion the lurid stories told by his patients were not phantasies at all, but actual or disguised

memories of real events of sexual molestation, just as Freud had at first claimed. Without supplying any verifying evidence for his opinions, specific to Freud's patients, Masson concludes that Freud behaved in a "cowardly" manner by rejecting the truth of his own discoveries. In an effort to avoid grappling with the unpopular subject of infant sexual abuse, Freud made a detour from the truth and "discovered" the Oedipus complex. In other words, in Masson's view, the discovery of the Oedipal complex was itself a fraud - - it replaced the awful truth of sexual molestation and supplanted that painful reality with a myth.

Freud's concoction of a myth of the Oedipal complex robbed patients of the reality of their own experiences, Masson asserts. Because of this "detour" Masson claims that psychoanalysis has been "sterile" ever since. Like the infamous Pinto automobile, Masson was fond of saying; patients by the tens of thousands should have to be "recalled." The implications of Masson's view in terms of malpractice suits are enormous. No wonder the psychoanalytic establishment takes umbrage over the claims and assertions of Dr. Jeffery Masson!

Yet the question may still be asked: is Masson really a Freud iconoclast, as the press and his own assertions would seem to indicate? Is he really a dangerous rebel in their midst? Or is he, rather, a Freudian apologist, himself a co-conspirator in the continuing systematic

corruption of the real history behind the mysterious Dr. Sigmund Freud? Let us examine the facts.

Actually, it has long been known to scholars in the field that the private letters of Freud have been intentionally altered, corrupted, censored, and even re-written by Anna Freud and her editorial colleagues. The pressure of this situation is, in fact, the main reason Anna Freud consented to a new issue of the Freud/Fliess correspondence in the first place, as Masson himself indicated in a recent magazine article in the *Atlantic Monthly*. For years, decades even, independent scholars pleaded for the right to see these letters that formed the claimed "scientific" basis of the development of Freud's theories. All were denied. As the historian E.M. Thornton has observed:

The embargo has been extended to serious researchers and historians. Writers of the caliber of Ellenberger, Roazen, Sulloway, Clark, authors of major works on Freud in the last decade, have been denied access to the correspondence.

And Thornton neglects to mention herself, who is certainly to be counted among the best of them.

Yet, leaks from the "secret letters" continued to trickle

out to Anna Freud's favorites. To be able to quote, even a scrap, from one of the censored letters gave prestige and "scholarly authority" in the psychoanalytic circles. Other "Freudian" scholars protested that they were not given access to the same information and internecine jealousies developed among them. Moreover, rumors began to circulate that something was wrong in the house of Freud, that there were perhaps terrible secrets being hidden in the uncensored letters.

Major biographers allude to the Freud mystery and point out many inconsistencies and enigmatic elements in Freud's background. One such writer is Peter Swales, often featured in connection with Masson, and widely recognized as one of the more knowledgeable and talented researchers among the new breed of Freud sleuths. Swales has given his assessment of the real Freud likely to emerge from a free and open investigation into Freud's past:

Needless to say, there is **no way** by which the Freud who emerges in the foregoing pages [one of Swales papers on Freud] and in certain other of my works is to be reconciled with, or incorporated into the standard received view of the man as "chaste and puritanical," as a scientist of "stern morality" and flawless integrity. . ."

Elsewhere Swales characterizes Freud, on the basis of his researches as "complex" "devious" and even "sinister." He states that in the *Interpretation of Dreams* Freud was weaving a "web of deception." Though Swales is essentially correct in this, he fails to provide significant insight into the essential meaning of "the web of deception" and his conclusions about Freud's sinister nature, and his findings regarding Freud's less than ideal character are neither "original" nor unique to Freud's biographers. That Freud was a total fraud and an inveterate liar is not voiced by Swales and he often swims in the same waters of admiration as the most embarrassing Freudians.

Since the deaths of Ernest Jones (Freud's first "official" biographer) and Max Schur (Freud's personal physician and biographer) no scholar could gain access to the secret files - - none, that is, until Jeffery Masson appeared on the scene. Masson himself emphasized the point to Swales during a period when they were exploring the possibility of collaboration on the editing of Freud's "unexpurgated" correspondence:

Because, even though you have done by far the greater amount of research and have much to offer the new edition, I also have material to which there is no possible way you could gain access without my help. Namely, the

unpublished Fliess letters, but also several hundred unpublished letters of Freud to which only I have been granted access to this material in return for the same courtesy on your part.

Curiously, the Freud "iconoclast" Dr. Jeffery Masson passed the scrutiny of the founder of the Freud Archives, Dr. Eissler, as well as Anna Freud, and was given the historic privilege and authorization to step forward and explain the motivation behind the intentional conspiracy to hide the real Freud from public view. Dr. Masson was an intimate of the inner circle of the Freud clique; for a year he served in the envied position of Director of the Freud Archives. Even before being appointed as Director he was allegedly given permission by Anna Freud for complete and unrestricted access to all information in the Freud Archives. If one can believe Masson's account of the situation, Anna Freud put herself in the position of having to plead with Masson not to publish information she herself had authorized him to release. In any case, while studying Freud's personal letters he discovered, in Masson's own words:

The truth is, however, that Freud had not been allowed his voice. Anna Freud and Ernst Kriss were so convinced that they had understood what Freud meant that they expunged from the public record

evidence to the contrary. (Masson, p.114)

The first volume of Freud's uncensored letters to his friend Fliess revealed, Masson declares, a "pattern in the omissions" in comparison to the official published edition of those letters. Not only was there a campaign of omissions, but the tactics of corruption included such techniques as total suppression of many letters, excisions of entire postscripts, internal tampering, and intentional mistranslation of the original German text. The purpose of these corruptions was to give the appearance Freud meant something other than what he actually said. Masson reported he found that Anna Freud merely drew red lines through offending passages and they were deleted from the "original" German edition.

When asked why numerous obviously important passages had been excised from the letters, without the appropriate editorial indications, Anna reportedly pleaded amnesia. She no longer knew why it was done, she said. Masson drew her attention to the excised portions of various letters, and one, in particular from Ferenczi -- Anna Freud confessed she had found the censored portions to be "painful reading."

Through various analysts friends intimate with the Freud family, Masson claims he was given to understand that he had encountered "something that was better left alone."

What Masson's claims to have discovered (i.e., that which was "better left alone") was that the systematic corruption of Freud's letters (to Fliess) was to conceal Freud's early ideas on the subject of incest, childhood rape, and psychoanalysis. After carefully studying what Freud actually wrote, the true history of the development of his ideas, Masson announced that he could come to only one conclusion: Freud had demonstrated "cowardice" in renouncing his early views on the origins of neurosis. Thus, we arrive at the meaning of the title of Masson's book, *Assault On Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction theory*.

Masson states that Freud primarily renounced his early ideas due to pressing need to: 1) curry favor with the medical establishment that had ostracized him because of his sex theories of childhood rape, and, 2) "rationalize" his involvement in a brutal experimental sex operation on one of his young women patients. Consequently Masson's book revolves around two themes: Freud's early views on child molestation and the experimental sex operation which Freud instigated and which caused him great fears of official reprisals, if not criminal prosecution and incarceration -- not to say execution at the hands of the law.

Strangely enough, Masson himself is apparently in complete agreement with Freud's early theories. His

book, in fact, sounds the plea for a return to the "early" Freud. Masson's principal complaint is that Freud was not always honest and had "a failure of courage." This failure of courage to tell the truth, according to Masson, was responsible for misleading legions of later analysts who followed Freud in his mistaken enshrinement of the Oedipal complex theory as an "explanation" of the origins of psychoneurosis. Masson would have us believe that the act of childhood sexual molestation is the fundamental fact behind psychotic and neurotic afflictions. And in this he is a mere echo of Freud's first position, formed in the early and middle 90's of the last century.

An indication of Masson's own perspective on Freud's early theories may be garnered from his remarks on the psychoanalytical works of Robert Fliess (the son of Freud's intimate friend, Wilhelm Fliess):

The final volume of the Psychoanalytic Series that Robert Fliess had been engaged in all his professional life appeared in 1973 as *Symbol, Dream, and Psychosis*. This volume constitutes an eloquent and intelligent plea for the return of Freud's early seduction theory to modern-day psychoanalytic practice. The heart of the book is an exposition of Robert Fliess's conviction that Freud

made a mistake when he abandoned the seduction hypothesis. He also explains why seductions are so often denied by analysts, and shows how deep amnesia reaches and how difficult it is to undo. His thesis is that **all** severe neurotics have been sexuality seduced or otherwise traumatized in early childhood by a psychotic (but often perfectly socially adjusted) parent, and in the process are violated, humiliated, and damaged.

Obviously Masson is in agreement with Robert Fliess's ideas which Fliess borrowed from Freud. Masson pronounces Robert Fliess' view to be an "eloquent and intelligent plea" for a "return" to Freud's early theory of childhood rape.

Actually, Robert Fliess's and Masson's idea of returning to Freud's extreme, absolutist, and aberrational theory is itself aberrational and extreme. That "all" cases of severe neurosis are caused by infant sexual abuse is ridiculous. Masson's continued acclamation of Freud's disturbed views is more than a little disconcerting, especially when he is supposed to be a Freud rebel and iconoclast. One thing we do learn, however, is that even the idea of charging Freud with having taken a mistaken path is not his own, (even on the specifics of the subject). It was Robert Fliess's who first published the

idea in 1973, some ten years before Masson's book. To other of Masson's aberrations, plagiarism might to added.

In view of the fact that Masson's perspective on Freud is almost totally dominated by this issue of infant sexual molestation, further consideration of this topic is appropriate. After all, the infant rape theory was originally at the heart of Freud's concepts of psychoanalysis. By taking a closer look at Freud's early "seduction theory" insight can be gained, not only into Freud's mind, but into the minds of the New Freudians, people such as Robert Fliess, and, most recently, Dr. Jeffery Masson, people who continue to perpetuate the early Freudian world-view.

Freud's early views were that *all* forms of hysteria, paranoia, and the various "psychoneurosis" were traceable to traumatic instances of childhood rape. These rapes generally occurred, according to Freud, between the ages of 6 months and 5 years of age. But the effect of the rapes did not have a psychic effect as symptoms until much later in life. Strangely, Freud even claims that these original sexual attacks do not in themselves cause a traumatic condition. It is only years later, usually in puberty, and after continued instances of sexual assault that there is a kind of "retroactive" affect (ed., see Chapter Screen Memories). Perhaps even more tellingly, Freud believed that infants and young toddlers

themselves often encourage and "tempt" sexual attacks upon themselves due to their own innate perversity. Consequently, the infant victims themselves are often "responsible" for their own rapes. How it is that an infant of six months old is "responsible" for tempting an adult to an incestuous rape is truly difficult to understand. Yet, in his early essays, Freud often suggested that the raped infant had a real share of guilt in the illicit and "incongruous union" -- to use Freud's own phrase.

Additionally, behind every case of severe neurotic symptoms, Freud claimed to have found unassailable evidence that the patient had, invariably, been raped as a child or infant. It is not Freud's theory that this is the case some of the time, but rather it was the case in each and every instance. Soon, in reference to Freud's own family background we will understand this strange absolutist requirement for *all* cases.

In support of his theories on childhood rape, Freud wrote various essays claiming to have "discovered" the astounding pervasiveness of child abuse. As these were the primary ideas upon which Freud intended to found his future fame, he went even further and boldly asserted that, due to the benefit of his theoretical idea and the techniques of psychoanalysis, he had been able to cure his patients of their great problems. These cures, according to Freud, proved the validity of his early theories on the subject.

Nonetheless it is a matter of fact, corroborated by Freud's own private admissions to Fliess, that not one of his patients was ever cured by him during the period he was advertising such cures in the professional journals. This assertion is, I believe, confirmed by the historic record. As E.M. Thornton writes in her detailing of Freud's patient cure frauds:

The inconvenient fact of the persistence of the patient's symptoms, however, failed to deter Freud. Still under the influence of Charcot's teaching that emotional trauma could cause bodily disease, he began, in 1889, to use the cathartic method to bring these traumas to light, working in collaboration with Breuer on cases of hysteria referred by the latter. These cases, along with that of Bertha Pappenheim, were eventually reported in *Studies in Hysteria*. As we shall see, in these patients too no cure was effected.

Masson Glosses over Freud's Family History of Sexual Perversions

Masson's declared purpose in writing his book was to

make public the real facts and history concerning Freud's ultimate denial of the theory of incestuous sexual abuse of infants. He wrote:

The purpose of this book is to make public evidence hereto unknown, ignored, or discounted that would point to a more illuminating explanation for the single most important step Freud took, one that helped shape the world we live in.

Curiously, however, throughout Masson's entire book he nowhere discusses an obviously pertinent fact linked to the subject of Freud's abandonment of his incest theory, namely, that Freud's own father, according to Freud's own testimony, was a sex pervert. This one fact alone casts Freud's biography, not to say his life's work, in a new and dramatic light. Yet Masson, the truth seeker, does not even discuss it. Most curious of all, perhaps, is that it was Masson himself who released this pertinent excerpt on the subject from one of Freud's censored letters some months before publication of his own book:

Unfortunately, my own father was one of these perverts and is responsible for the hysteria of my brother (all of whose symptoms are identifications) and those of several of my younger sisters.

Masson does not give the date of his excerpt. Obviously in an examination of Freud's family background the date of the letter is of telling significance. Fortunately, however we do not need Masson's secret Freud letters to explore the issue. There are other published instances where Freud claimed his father was a sex pervert. Discussing his childhood rape theory in a letter in 1897, Freud stated that:

Then came the surprise that in all cases, the father, not excluding my own, had to be blamed as a sex pervert.

Since Freud frequently referred to his so-called Seduction Theory as the "father etiology" (meaning that the father was the person usually responsible for the incest rape) Masson's avoidance of this aspect of Freud's biography is enigmatic and very revealing.

Masson also, for some reason, quickly passes over Freud's repeated explicit suggestion that he himself had been sexually molested between the ages of one and two by his nursemaid and that, in his own case of childhood rape, it was not his father who played the "active role." Apparently it was otherwise with his 10 year younger brother and several of his sisters, as attested to by Freud himself. In the following declaration, for example, Freud is apparently implying that he himself is also to be

counted among the same sort of sexual pervert as his father:

I can only indicate that the old man played no active role in my case, though I certainly projected onto him an analogy from myself.

The statement can only mean that he himself was a sexual pervert with a proclivity for sexual molestation of his own children. Actually, Freud several times intimated his sexual proclivity for his children. In one telling letter Freud wrote to his friend Fliess that he was dreaming of having "overly affectionate" feelings for his 10 year old daughter, Mathilda. The dream, Freud said, represented his desire to "pin down a father as the originator of neurosis and put an end to my persistent doubts." It is most interesting that in the same letter (in a series of notes added to the letter) Freud further offers the following remarks in defense of incest and child molestation. Freud titled this note The Definition of Saintliness:

"Holy" is something based on the fact that human beings, for the benefit of the larger community, have sacrificed a portion of their sexual liberty and their liberty to indulge in sexual perversions. The horror of incest (something impious) is based on

the fact that, as a result of a communal sexual life (even in childhood), the members of a family remains together permanently and become incapable of joining with strangers. Thus incest is anti-social -- civilization consists in this progressive renunciation. Contrariwise the "Superman." (Freud, Masson, p.252)

That which is "holy" is the result of sacrificing the freedom for sexual perversions to achieve sociability?

Freud's meaning is quite clear. The Superman, or Übermensch, is a concept of the philosopher Frederick Nietzsche who espoused the idea that there was a superior class of men who were not bound, as others, to the conventions of morality. Unlike their bourgeois counterparts, the Supermen did not let their lives be ruled by the morals of others -- and were free to indulge in the sexual perversions. It is hardly to be doubted that Freud considered himself and Fliess to be of the superior type and hence not bound to the ordinary morality. For them incest was not prohibited. Of course, the idea that the Superman had the right to indulge in the sexual perversions, even with children, was not Nietzsche's idea at all; rather this is Freud's personal interpretation of what the Superman may permit himself. In another letter of 1897 Freud wrote again:

My own dreams have taken on an absurd complexity. Recently I was told that little Anna said on Aunt Minna's birthday: "On birthdays I'm usually rather good", whereupon I dreamed my usual school-dream, I found myself in the sixth class and said to myself; "In this sort of dream one usually is in the sixth class." The only possible explanation is that Anna is my sixth child. *Brrr. . . !*

[“six” in German is pronounced "sex."
ellipsis in original]

Anna Freud was only one and a half years old at the time of this letter. She was not in the "sixth" ("sex") grade; it was *Freud* himself, ("I found myself in the sixth class. . ."). These biographical facts (and many others of a like nature) certainly ought to be considered in any examination of the motivation of Freud's "abandonment" of the incest rape theory. Yet, Masson is silent on the issue and, for one reason or another; himself totally avoids the issue of Freud's personal affinities for various perversions. Why? Not only does Masson not discuss the issue of sexual perversion and the Freud family, but in presenting his work to the public he attempts to hide the significant facts and to deflect attention from the central issue. In an end-note buried in the back of his

book, Masson makes the following remark:

5. There has been a great deal of speculation about the significance of Freud's letter to Fliess of Oct.3, 1897 (published in *Origins*), centering on Freud's comments about his nurse maid. Freud often indicated that he regarded himself as mildly hysterical. In this letter, which deals with his self analysis through dreams, Freud writes: "I can only indicate that the old man plays no active part no active part in my case . . . that in my case the prime originator' (Urheberin) was an ugly elderly but clever woman who told me a great deal about God Almighty and hell and who instilled in me a high opinion of my own capacities."

It is interesting that Masson excised from his quotation the most critical part of the quotation which needs to be reinserted in the area of the ellipsis, **"though I certainly projected onto him an analogy from myself."** Concerning this passage Masson obliquely states: "It seems to me that Freud is hinting at a sexual seduction, but this is not entirely clear." It is difficult to understand why Masson is not clear about Freud's claim that he was

“seduced” by his nursemaid. Freud himself later in the letter specifically states (though Masson does not quote it):

She was my instructress in sexual matters, and chided me for being clumsy and not being able to do anything (that is the way it is with neurotic impotence: anxiety over incapacity at school gets its sexual reinforcement in this way).

Freud specifically emphasizes the issue as to leave no mistake about what he was talking about. Max Schur and most every other historian and commentator on this aspect of Freud's background takes it for a fact and Freud himself represented it as a fact, but Masson can only glean that Freud might be hinting about a "sexual seduction," -- in other words Freud's own childhood rape! To make his meaning absolutely clear Freud further wrote, in the same letter which Masson is discussing:

A severe critic might say all this was phantasy projected into the past instead of being determined by the past. The *experimenta cruxis* would decide the matter against him.

In another remark concerning Freud's abandonment of

the incest child rape theory, Masson again tries to conceal the truth from the reader. Discussing Freud's comments regarding this rejection of his own earlier views, Masson quotes Freud as saying:

I believed these stories, and consequently supposed that I had discovered the roots of the subsequent neurosis in these experiences of sexual seduction in childhood. . . . If the reader feels inclined to shake his head at my credulity, I cannot altogether blame him. . . . I was at last obliged to recognize that these scenes of seduction had never taken place, and that they were only fantasies which my patients had made up. [ellipsis in original]

The reference for this quotation is given by Masson as "An Auto biographical Study" (1925) S.E. 20, p. 34 (G.W., 14, p. 59)." Here, too, Masson corrupts his source material to achieve his purposes. The actual quotation reads:

I was at last obliged to recognize that these scenes of seduction had never taken place, and that they were only fantasies which my patients had made up *or which I myself had perhaps forced on them*

[italics added].

Masson ends his sentence with the quoted sentence, ". . . which my patients had made up." But there is no period in this referenced quotation. The quote continues as indicated in the above italics.

Masson apparently doesn't want what Freud actually said to interfere with the point he is trying to make. So he simply corrupts the text, *a la* Anna Freud. Again it is obvious that the important significance of Freud's remark was his admission that he had perhaps "forced" upon his patients their "memories" of the rape scenes. While it is true that Freud stated later in the same piece that he did not really believe that he had forced the seduction fantasies on his patients—but rather, he had, in fact, "stumbled" onto the "discovery" of the Oedipus complex theory. Nonetheless, this is mere posturing. Anyone who takes the trouble to consult Freud's early essays on child molestation will discover numerous instances of Freud's mendacity concerning the validity of his scientific "evidence" for his "seduction theory."

In the "Aetiology of Hysteria," for instance, Freud claims to have discovered that:

. . .at the bottom of every case of hysteria
there are one or more occurrences of
premature sexual experience which

belong to the earliest years of childhood
(p. 263)

In his early essays Freud claimed his "evidence" was highly important and constituted the essence of a great discovery. Indeed, he compared this evidence as equivalent to "the discovery of a *caput Nili* (source of the Nile) in neuropathology."

Yet, in his essay on the "Aetiology of the Neurosis," written a few years before officially recanting his theory, and while still under the delusion that he had discovered a great truth, Freud had written:

Only the strongest compulsion of the treatment can induce them to embark on a reproduction of them. . . They have no feeling of the scenes (memories). . . It is less easy to refute the idea that the doctor forces reminiscences of this sort on the patient, that he influenced him by suggestion to imagine and reproduce them. Nevertheless it appears to me equally untenable [i.e. objections to Freud's theory]. I have never yet succeeded in forcing on a patient a scene I was expecting to find in such a way that he seemed to be living through it with all appropriate feelings. Perhaps others will

be more successful in this.

Here, again, the reader of Freud's works encounters contradictory statements in the same paragraph. For Freud states that only the strongest compulsion of the treatment can "induce" the patient to reproduce these scenes. In fact, Freud repeatedly mentions in his early essays that the patient cannot remember these "scenes" because they are locked in the subconscious mind and are not accessible to consciousness. Hence, the necessity of the "talking cure" of psychoanalysis. In view of this, how could Freud's patients tell him stories about these scenes without him "forcing" or "inducing" the patient to remember scenes which Freud states he "expected" to find?

In his "Autobiographical Essay" (1925) Freud stated that he was misled into the nearly "fatal" error of believing in his early theories because the majority of his patients produced for him what he wanted them to produce. But In his essay "Aetiology of Hysteria," for example, Freud observed:

Before they come for analysis the patients know nothing about these scenes [of their early sexual rapes, *ed.*]. They are indignant as a rule if we warn them that such scenes are going to emerge.

What explanation is there left as to how Freud's patients actually came upon these memories other than that Freud himself suggested them to his patients? In fact, he warned them that such scenes were going to emerge.

None of these issues, however, seem to matter to Masson who believes Freud's case histories are authentic and constitute scientific "evidence" of the truth of childhood rape and neurotic symptoms. That Freud renounced this alleged evidence of sexual assault was, according to Masson, a "travesty of the truth." Apparently Masson does not realize that these were no real case histories but were themselves the perverse inventions of Freud's own diseased mind. It appears Masson himself may have the same problem as Freud when it comes to what he is willing to accept as a basis of evidence of the pervasiveness of childhood incestuous sexual assault. This is not to deny that the problem of child abuse is a very real and critical one for our contemporary societies, but the acknowledgement of a problem does not constitute scientific evidence for proving or disproving anything.

Moreover, anyone who studies the record of Freud's essays and private published letters will soon discover that Freud was severely disturbed during the period in which he formulated his early views on the rape of infants and his famous Oedipus complex theory. Only a

few years earlier he had been directly responsible for advocating experimental injections of dangerous drugs and falsely claimed cures for morphinism in the medical reviews. The adoption of Freud's prescription for this cure led to many deaths -- perhaps even hundreds or thousands. For this reason he was rightly shunned by his medical colleagues as a "public menace." At the time of writing his infant rape ideas he was producing a constant outpouring of writings dealing with his preoccupation with feces and the sexual perversions; he submitted himself to nose operations performed by Fliess to cure him of his own "hysteria;" he obsessively wrote letters to Fliess expressing an impassioned "longing" to see his friend; he arranged a brutal experimental operation on one of patients, Emma Eckstein, (the subject of Emma will be taken up shortly); he had become a severe cocaine addict and in various states of megalomaniacal intoxication fancied he was creating, with Fliess, a numerological scheme to comprehend the universe; he confessed he could not even work without being in a state of "semi misery;" he was frequently seized with a neurotic horror that he was imminently about to die in expiation of secret misdeeds; he suffered severe migraines, incontinence of the bowels, chronic sinusitis, and a host of other physical and psychological ailments. In short, Freud during this entire period was himself severely ill, mentally and morally. Yet, little if any of this is discussed by Masson in his book purporting to strip the mask of conspiratorial deception off the

censored face of the real Freud.

In short, Masson has followed Freud into a pit of delusions, and, like Freud, encourages the reader into his world of confused understandings and "fatal" errors. In view of this it is perhaps not so difficult to understand why Masson, the "Freud iconoclast," was authorized to translate Freud's personal letters and why his research work was underwritten by the New Land Foundation, a key organization dedicated to the furtherance of Freudian psychoanalysis. Masson himself, however, claims to have found the situation rather strange:

I found myself in a strange position. When I became a psychoanalyst, I believed that Freud had fearlessly pursued truth, that he wanted to help his patients face their personal histories, and the wrongs inflicted on them, no matter how unpleasant. My analytic training taught me early on that these ideals were not shared by the profession at large. But I did not think they had altogether vanished from the science; surely there were still people who uncompromisingly sought out truth. That is why, I argued to myself, I had been encouraged in my research; no restrictions had been placed on it.

Does Masson want us to believe that he is such a fellow, one who is uncompromisingly searching out the truth, and that is why Anna Freud arranged for him to be the translator of Freud's letters, despite his lack of credentials and despite the fact that Anna Freud was the principal architect of the corruption in the first place? No wonder Masson "found himself" in a strange position. But it would be even stranger for the public to accept his version of the real situation in view of the continuing and persistent corruption of the record, with his own hand.

Part 11 - The Case of Emma Eckstein

When Analysts read my book "Assault On Truth" in which Emma will loom very large, they will ask for my neck, I assure you. They will say, "He was bad enough at Yale, he was worse in those articles in the Times and now he's utterly impossible. The man must be murdered." I won't be surprised if the analytic mafia puts out a contract on me.

Dr. Jeffery Masson, (*New Yorker Magazine*
12/18/84)

Masson's central and, as a "scholar", his fatal error

concerns the subject of Emma Eckstein. Masson would have us believe it was while reviewing the correspondence between Freud and Fliess (only Freud's half is extant) that he discovered 10 letters that had been completely censored in the published collection. The reason for this censorship is easy to establish. All the letters concern Freud's sadistic, if not murderous, participation in a sex operation involving the removal of a turbinate bone from the nasal cavity of Freud's beautiful young patient, Emma Eckstein. The significance of these letters was known, of course, to its editors, one of whom, Strachey, had written to Ernest Jones in 1951:

I was very much interested by your account of the suppressed passages in the Fliess letters. It's really a complete instance of *folie a deux*, with Freud in the unexpected role of hysterical partner to a paranoiac. I do hope if they ever come out in English the censorship may be lifted a bit. Unless Anna proposes to burn the originals, they're bound to come out in the end and surely its better that they should while people are alive who can correct their effect.

Interesting. Strachey hopes that if the letters ever come out in English there will still be people around in the

Freud circle who can "correct their effect." What Strachey clearly means is that he hopes someone will, by some means, be able to rationalize the clear and evident meaning of the letters. Masson himself appears to be such a candidate. The above quoted remark, supplied by Masson, is to be found only in his end-notes. In the body of his book, however, Masson evasively characterizes "hysterical" Freud and "paranoiac" Fliess as "two overzealous doctors." Also interesting is that Masson contradicts himself on the issue of what Strachey knew or did not know concerning the abortive operation. Quoting Strachey in the body of his book, Masson writes:

Section 4 of the "Project" (S.E., 1, pp. 352-356) is an attempt to explain the origins of an apparently indecipherable symptom in a patient who is called Emma. Strachey, in his note to p. 353 writes: "Freud seems not to have mentioned this case elsewhere." This is because all references to this patient were omitted in the published version of Freud's letters to Fliess, and thus Strachey was not aware of them.

In this remark Masson pins his hopes of being believed on the assumption that the reader does not know that Strachey was one of the editors of the Freud/Fliess

correspondence. Masson tries to lure the reader into believing that Strachey only had access to the published version of Freud's letters, "thus Strachey was not aware of them." Of course, Masson's own quoting of Strachey on the subject of "hysterical" Freud acting as accomplice to "paranoiac" Fliess, in specific reference to the Emma operation, belies Masson's assertion. The remark is obviously intended to mislead the reader and exonerate Strachey for his complicity in the Freud cover-up. Freud's essay entitled "Project" was specifically written for Fliess in the fall of 1895 - only a few months after the operation and Emma's near fatal collapse. The fact is, Strachey had read the Freud letters concerning Emma and his assertion that "Freud seems not to have mentioned this case elsewhere" is an obvious falsehood.

Strachey's comments to Jones were confidential and in themselves prove Strachey knew about and participated in the cover-up. Publicly Strachey "played ball" and claimed that Emma was not mentioned elsewhere in Freud's letters. In the published version of the Freud/Fliess correspondence (Letter 22) it is stated:

At best a little parallel to D's dream psychosis.

Masson himself cites this quotation in his book. But there Masson translates a part of this passage thusly:

"At most a small analogy to Emma E's dream psychosis which we witnessed.

Masson makes no note of the fact that the translation was corrupted and the name of "Emma E." was designated as "D" in the original publication of the Freud letter's to Fliess in *Origins of Psychoanalysis*. At the outset of his discussion we get a glimpse of Masson's *mendacious* and rather crude attempts to mislead his readers by not informing them of material facts bearing on Freud's criminal behavior.

Since Masson claims himself to be the great "discoverer" of the true significance of the letters concerning Emma, he must first discredit or diminish the significance of the work of Dr. Max Schur who originally released the main substance of all the letters relating to Emma some 14 years previous to Masson's book. To set himself on center stage, Masson wishes to make it appear that Schur did not see the entire file of these letters and so presumably could not have realized their significance. Here Masson employs the same crude and illogical manipulation of language as was the case with his remarks about Strachey. In an effort to "prove" that Schur did not really know the significance of the "Emma letters" Masson wrote:

Ernest Freud and Max Schur had planned to edit the complete edition of Freud's

letters to Fliess, and, for this purpose Schur had in his possession some of the original manuscripts and part of the transcript. The text was not complete (p. 84 n.): "I plan at a later date to study once again the originals of this correspondence because some of the letters still have to be transcribed."

Schur states that he plans to study "once again the originals." The simple reason given by Schur is that the originals, which he had read, needed to be read again before the transcripts could be completed. By what route of reasoning Masson arrives at the conclusion that Schur had only some of the originals and part of the transcripts is unknown. Transcripts are made from originals, not the other way around. It must be remembered that when Schur published the incriminating letters concerning the operation on Emma he made specific reference to Emma as the person featured in one of Freud's dreams in the *Interpretation of Dreams*, "The Dream of Irma's Injection." "The Dream of Irma's Injection" was the first of Freud's own dreams which he submitted to a detailed analysis in his famous dream book. In order to establish himself as the person who saw things for the first time in their true light (i.e. the effect of the Emma incident on the development of Freud's theories), Masson must charge Schur with fundamental errors and misunderstandings.

Masson seeks to nullify Schur's contribution by simply stating that Schur was "mistaken" in his identification of Emma as the patient in the famous Dream of Irma's Injection. If one would believe such a thing, then it is Masson, not Schur, who is to be credited with having an historic insight into the inner workings of Freud's mind. As we shall see, it is on this subject of Emma (Irma) that Masson's scholarship is provably, and as I believe, intentionally, corrupt and calculated to "correct the effect" of the ghoulish nature of Freud's own dreams and doings.

In Masson's accounting of the story of the operation on Emma he states:

Early in 1895 Fliess performed surgery on one of Freud's first analytic patients, Emma Eckstein (1865-1924). Emma Eckstein's name has been all but forgotten in the history of psychoanalysis, and had she not been mistakenly identified with the patient Freud called "Irma" in his discussion of the "dream-specimen" in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, she would not be remembered at all today.

At this point in his text Masson inserts a footnote and

there states:

1. Ronald Clark, in Freud: *The Man and the Cause* (New York; Random House, 1980) p. 149, writes that "Irma's real name was Emma." . . .

Masson then continues (in the end note) to suggest that Clark had probably gotten his information from Paul Roazen (a prominent Freud scholar) who had gotten it from Alfred Hirst. Masson declares he read the interview with Hirst (Emma Eckstein's nephew) and Hirst had not actually stated that Emma was Irma but that this was Roazen's "surmise." Masson then goes on to say he had it under the authority of Anna Freud that the Irma of *The Interpretation of Dreams* was a woman named Anna Hammerschlag: "Anna Freud confirmed to me that she was "Irma." That Masson would use Anna Freud as a reference of authority is curious considering he himself indicts her of systematic corruption of Freud's work. And certainly Anna Freud herself knew how important it was to throw off any would-be sleuths investigating the issue.

In any case, it is not clear why Masson would use Ronald Clark as a reference for the identification of Emma as Irma, for it was Schur (1969) who identified Irma as Emma 11 years previous to the publication of Ronald Clark's book. In his book *Freud: Living and*

Dying, Schur claims he was given complete access to the Freud/Fliess correspondence. He states, "I was given access to all the correspondence and material of the Freud Copyright, Ltd." And again, Schur wrote: "With the help of the unabridged Fliess correspondence . . . " Yet, Masson would have us believe it was otherwise. In end-note 4 (in the same chapter section as Masson's reference to the work of Ronald Clark) Masson himself cites Schur's work as a reference. Why didn't Masson assume that Ronald Clark obtained his understanding of the identification of Irma as Emma from Schur, whose work is referred to by Clark? Masson is just seeking to cause confusion. But for a reason.

Incredibly, the only evidence Masson offers that Emma is not Irma is that "There is no mention of a nose operation in the dream." Here Masson makes his critical mistake as it is apparent that, either he has not read "The Dream of Irma's Injection," -- making him a totally incompetent writer on the matter -- or he wishes to hide the deeper truth from the public. In the "Dream of Irma's Injection" Freud specifically states that when he looked down his patient's throat he noticed three remarkably curly structures which reminded him of the turbinate bones. This quotation from the *Interpretation of Dreams*, the section dealing with the Dream of Irma's Injection will sufficiently make the point:

At another place I saw extensive whitish gray scabs upon some remarkably curly structures, which were evidently modeled on the turbinate bones of the nose.

Surely Masson knows that the turbinate bones are located in the nasal cavity. In fact, he had to know this as he himself translated the letters from Freud discussing the operation where these matters are specifically discussed. Another of Masson's efforts to "correct the effect" of the truth behind the situation of Emma's operation is contained in the following remark:

If Freud's consent to such an operation seems puzzling, his idealization of Fliess as a great healer must be considered.

Masson wishes to make it appear that Freud is the passive party in the plan for the operation. This is untrue and misleading. In Freud's letter to Fliess, dated March 8, 1895, only a short time after the operation and Emma's near death, he wrote:

The fact that this mishap should have happened to you, how you would react to it when you learned about it, what others would make of it, how wrong I had been to press you to operate in a foreign city where you couldn't handle the aftercare,

how my intention of inflicting the best on the poor girl was insidiously thwarted. . .

It was Freud who had wrongly "insisted" on the operation. In fact, in this same letter Freud asserted that he and Fliess had "done her an injustice" and that "she had not been abnormal at all." It is further clear what one of Freud's main motives was in arranging the operation - - namely, Freud's longing desire to be united with Fliess again. For the operation gave Fliess the opportunity to travel from Berlin to Vienna. Freud wrote: "Now only one more week separates us from the operation." That Emma's needs were not the ones considered is demonstrated by Masson himself. Referring to another letter by Freud to Fliess he stated that Fliess wasn't even very familiar with Emma's case. Masson states:

The passage is also interesting in that Freud admits he had turned his patient over to Fliess without first discussing her case with him in detail.

Emma nearly died numerous times; at one point Freud gave her up for dead. This beautiful young woman besides being put in mortal danger by the operation was also permanently disfigured. One side of her nose "caved in" as a result of the brutal operation. Schur, who first brought this "incident" to light stated:

The previously unpublished correspondence of these months revealed Freud's desperate attempts to deny any realization of the fact that Fliess would have been convicted of malpractice in any court for this nearly fatal error.

What Schur and Masson, Freudians both, fail to state is that, had Emma died, both Freud and Fliess would probably have been indicted under charges of murder as well as malpractice.

It is interesting to note Freud's reaction to all this. After stating that Emma had another relapse and almost died again Freud continues his letter by stating that he was "inconsolable." He was not inconsolable, however, over the suffering caused Emma (Irma), and her near death, so much as he was inconsolable for the distress that the situation caused his "Übermensch" friend, Fliess.

In my thoughts, I have given up hope for the poor girl, and am inconsolable that I involved you and created such a distressing affair for you. I also feel sorry for her; I had become very fond of her.

Freud was not only fond of Emma but Masson himself, echoing Freud's previous biographer, Ernest Jones, asserts that he was "passionately" fond of her. Masson,

however, rather than indicting Freud, clearly attempts to have Fliess appear as the primary guilty party. In the following quotation Masson is discussing, in a sub-chapter entitled "The Witch Must Die," the diabolical aspect of Freud's and Fliess' intent. After presenting more hacked-up excerpts from some of the censored letters of this period Masson states:

Freud is implying that the Sabbats were real events (part of a ritualized religion in which sexual perversions were acted out). He seems to be saying: The torture and the murder of the witch are understandable, for the judges were attempting to curtail a heinous cult.

Unpleasant chains of association are set off: if Fliess is the judge, and Emma is the witch, then Freud, as observer, suddenly understands why Fliess had to be so harsh in his punishment of her - she was, during the operation, secretly enacting her own ritual, using Fliess's operation as a kind of somatic compliance - she bled, not in response to Fliess, but in response to her own private, internal theatre of fantasy. So, if she nearly bled to death, it was not because of Fliess but because of her own perverse imagination. (Masson, p.106)

Masson casts Freud in the role of the "observer" and Fliess in the role of the Satanic figure who has come to punish and even murder Emma. Masson suggests that Freud arrived at this bizarre interpretation of the situation in order to justify Fliess. Of course, there is nothing new in Masson's interpretation. It is straight "establishment" Freud canon. Most of Masson's remarks on the subject of Freud, Fliess, and the operation on Emma are little more than a rehash of Schur's work of some two decades ago. The standard view is that it was Fliess to blame, not Freud; or, if Freud was to blame, then only moderately so, and, anyway it can be explained by his fascination with Fliess's genius insight into the nature of the universe and his ability to read the numerological signs of fate. Here is another "rationalization" of Freud's illicit involvement in the "Emma affair" from Masson's pen:

If Freud means that Emma Eckstein herself had not been "abnormal" prior to the operation, an even greater insight, then he and Fliess had no business subjecting her to a theory that was put into practice in a life threatening operation. For it is one thing to hold "abnormal" views and quite another to test those theories by operative inter-

vention for which one possesses neither the surgical knowledge nor the requisite skills.

Masson's comment is interesting. In the first place, it is curious that Masson would use the optative case, "If Freud means that Emma Eckstein had not been 'abnormal'. . ." since that is exactly what Freud stated: "She had not been abnormal at all." It is clearly the case that Freud meant exactly what he said. Why does Masson say "if"?

It is hardly likely that courts of law would see things in the same light as Masson and Freud's other "authorized" biographers. Freud's confession to "torturing" Fliess to operate, his "pressing" him to do it, his handing over of the victim, his presence at the operation, his confession to wanting to "inflict the best" on her, and his gross neglect of Emma's aftercare would convict Freud along with Fliess. A significant discussion of Freud's legal and ethical quilt is almost entirely absent from Masson's book, yet he has time and words enough to suggest that one of the psychotic intentions behind the operation was homicidal - *but it was Fliess's homicidal intent, not Freud's!* It is a matter of record, however, that we have ample evidence of Freud's homicidal mania, and virtually nothing of Fliess's. Yet Masson quotes from Freud's personal letters to set a false scene, for, in fact, it

is Freud who develops the idea that Emma was a witch, not Fliess. It is Freud who produces "evidence" of Emma's "witchcraft." The truth is it was primarily Freud's idea that gave birth to the idea that Emma was a witch and that was the reason she bled so copiously - not the fact of the surgery. In the very first letter (allegedly) where Freud discussed the subject of witchcraft (Jan. 17, 1897) he began with these words:

Do you remember my always saying that the medieval theory of possession, that held by the ecclesiastical courts, was identical with our theory of a foreign body and the splitting of consciousness? But why did the devil who took possession of the poor victims invariably abuse them sexually and in such a loathsome manner? Why are the confessions extracted under torture so like the communications made by my patients under psychological treatment? I must delve into the literature of the subject. Incidentally, the cruelties practiced serves to illuminate some hitherto obscure symptoms of hysteria. The pins which appear in such astonishing ways, the needles for which the poor creatures have their breasts cut open, though they are invisible with X-rays, can all be found in

the stories of seduction (Ed., i.e. rape). As far as the blood is concerned, you are completely without blame. Emma has a scene where the Diabolus sticks pins into her finger and puts a piece of candy on each drop of blood.

The inquisitors now again search with needles for diabolical stigmata, and the victims again invent the same gruesome stories (aided perhaps by the seducer's disguise). Thus victim and torturer alike recall their earliest youth.

Masson says the answer to the question of why the confessions of Freud's patients are so like those of the "victims" of the ecclesiastical court is a very important one, but Masson says "Freud did not provide it." Of course, if one discontinues reading the actual quotation at the point of the question, or has no more of the quote than what Masson provides then it may very well seem that Freud does not answer the question. But for those who read the entire actual quotation as given above, it is not likely one would arrive at the idea Freud had no response to his own question. Obviously Freud and Fliess are the "inquisitors" who search again with needles, whose deeds are aided by the "disguise" of being doctors.

Freud's next letter, of January 24, 1897 continues the same obsessive and perverse idea:

My Dear Wilhelm,

The parallel with witchcraft is taking shape, and I believe it is conclusive. Details have started crowding in; I have found the explanation why witches "fly": their broomstick is apparently the great Lord Penis. Their secret gatherings, with dances and other entertainment can be seen any day in the streets where children play.

Freud goes on in this letter to express his frustration that he cannot know why the "devil's semen" is always described as "cold." Not only was the idea of witches and the origin of neurosis an "identical" idea of his own but in this letter Freud states there was "conclusive" relationship between them. Further, Freud began to see the work of witches at play in crowds of young children, and their "innocent" games, such as riding the broomstick, as reenactment of diabolical phallic rites. In this same letter Freud continues:

I am toying with the idea that in the perversions, of which hysteria is the negative, we may have the remnants of a primitive sexual cult, which in the Semitic east may once have been a

religion (Moloch, Astarte). Imagine, I obtained a scene about the circumcision of a girl. The cutting of a piece of the labia minora (which is still shorter today), sucking up the blood, following which the child was given a piece of the skin to eat. An operation once performed by you was affected by a hemophilia which originated in this way.

Perverted sexual actions are always alike, always have a meaning, and are based on a pattern which can be understood.

I dream, therefore, of a primeval Devil religion, whose rites are carried on secretly, and I understand the severe therapy of the witches' judges. The connecting links team.

This letter clearly reflects Freud's dangerous mental state. Freud sees the work of the witches in the nursery, infants riding huge phallus, he has gruesome preoccupations with Emma's "memories" of her clitoris being severed as a child as part of a Devil religion ceremony (a memory Freud no doubt "forced" upon her), her sucking up blood, licking blood like candy, eating the flesh of her own "circumcision." In this supercharged delusional state of mind Freud claims to

have arrived at his "understanding" of the severe therapy needed for the Emma-witch type. Freud is obviously in the grips of a murderous fantasy about Emma, a fantasy that preceded and continued after her operations. But the reader will learn little of this by reading Masson's book, for Masson has carefully censored his material to give the impression that Freud is merely "going along" with Fliess on the operation rather than being fully involved in every diabolical aspect of it. As severe judges of witches, perversity was a form of freedom for them, something they could allow themselves.

Masson further participates in the corruption of the historical record of Freud's real nature by concealing material facts regarding Freud's own "devil possession." In the same letter quoted above (Letter 57, Jan. 24, 1897) Freud wrote (not quoted by Masson):

Stories about the devil, the vocabulary of popular swear-words, the rhymes and habits of the nursery, are all gaining significance for me. Can you without trouble suggest some good reading on the subject from your well-stocked memory?

In connection with the dances in witches' confessions you will recall the dancing epidemics of the Middle Ages. E.'s nurse was a dancing witch of that kind. The memory of her, consistently enough, first

returned at the ballet; hence his fear of the theatre.

Who is the "E." in the above quotation? One would imagine it is a man since it states "hence his fear of the theatre." Or is this another suppressed reference to Emma which the translators have "masculinized" to avoid any scholars being able to trace the real record concerning Emma? It will be recalled in another letter "D" was used to designate Emma and elsewhere "E." was used to designate Emma. If this above passage does not relate to Emma then Freud is seeing other of his patients as being possessed by the devil as well. But I rather suspect it is Emma as Masson specifically quotes excised passages from this same letter in reference to Freud's characterization of Emma as a witch. In fact in another letter (enclosure to Letter 61) only three months later "E." is specifically identified as a woman.

But even more importantly is the question of Freud's state of mind during this period. Here is another letter (Letter 24) in May of 1895, **two months after the operation on Emma** which illuminates the degree of Freud's disturbance and the extent of his willingness to risk anyone and anything to his own obsessions:

But the chief reason was this: a man like me cannot live without a hobby-horse, a consuming passion - in Schiller's words a

tyrant. I have found my tyrant, and in his service I know no limits. My tyrant is psychology;

It is important for Masson to disguise the fact that Emma was the Irma of the "Dream of Irma's Injection." The additional information, which knowledge of the connection supplies, concerning Emma leads directly into further shocking revelations about the "father of psychoanalysis." This concerns Freud's previous history of producing "victims" (*sans* the help of Fliess) of which he alone was the "severe judge." The linkage of Freud and the "Emma letters," and Freud and his own comments about his own past reveals Freud in his fuller psychopathic nature. The "Emma affair" is only one among many such "affairs" for Freud. A few brief remarks about the "Dream of Irma's Injection" are therefore appropriate.

The Irma Dream

The "Dream of Irma's Injection" is preceded with a preamble. In the preamble Freud informs his readers of the circumstances that gave rise to the dream which he is going to analyze. *He declares that he selected this dream to feature because its meaning was immediately clear to him.* He tells his readers that the night before the dream he had received news that one of his patients (i.e., Irma/Emma) had another relapse and he imagined that

others were thinking he was guilty of some serious deficiency in his medical treatment of Emma, or “Irma.” Freud says that, after a visit from a friend, he retired and immediately began to produce a case history of his patient. Most interesting of all, perhaps, is that Freud said that the case history he was writing was for the specific purpose of creating a "defense" for himself! The case history was to be his "exculpation" of his involvement in the Irma case. It was going to be a document which he could use with the authorities if necessary. Freud then narrates that after writing his "alibi" he went to bed and had a dream. This was the “Dream of Irma's Injection" which Freud analyzed at length in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Fortunately, Freud supplied the date of this dream (July 24, 1895) in one of his letters to Fliess so we can now see all that Freud wrote on the subject of "Irma" in the dream book in relationship with the actual facts of Freud's involvement in the brutal, hideous, operation on Emma Eckstein.

Though the "Dream of Irma's Injection" is widely considered the most famous of Freud's personal dreams and is used as a basic reference work for training psychoanalysts, no scholar that I know of has ever investigated or sought to determine what happened to Freud's case history that he wrote the night before having the "Irma" dream? Apparently, it was just assumed that the piece had not survived, for certainly the existence of

such an "alibi" case history written immediately before Freud had his dream would provide rich materials for studying Freud's dream and his interpretation of that dream. But another of history's ironies shows itself for Masson, apparently without realizing the fact, has himself unearthed, if not the case history itself, at least notes for this case history. This may be Masson's greatest unwitting contribution to the history of the discovery of the real Freud. Of course, since Masson explicitly denies that Emma is Irma, he could not have known the significance of his discovery or he intentionally seeks to distort the truth and deceive his readers. On May 4, 1896 Freud wrote his surviving case history notes on Emma. This information was not discovered previously because all of it had been censored from the published portion of the letter, so no scholar could have known about it previous to Masson's disclosure. I will quote the excerpt in full exactly as Masson translates it (Masson does not provide any of the German for his translations so one cannot judge of their validity. The reader is warned, however, that many of his translations are in demonstrable error and so we must view anything Masson says with skepticism):

As for Eckstein - I am taking notes on her history so that I can send it to you - so far I know only that she bled out of longing. She has always been a bleeder, when cutting herself and in similar

circumstances; as a child she suffered from severe nosebleeds; during the years when she was not yet menstruating, she had headaches which were interpreted to her as malingering and which in truth had been generated by suggestion; for this reason she joyously welcomed her severe menstrual bleeding as proof that her illness was genuine, a proof that was also recognized as such by others. She described a scene, from the age of 15, when she suddenly began to bleed from the nose when she had the wish to be treated by a certain young doctor who was present (and who also appeared in the dream). When she saw how affected I was by her first hemorrhage while she was in the hands of Rosanes, she experienced this as the realization of an old wish to be loved in her illness, and in spite of the danger during the succeeding hours she felt happy as never before. Then in the sanitarium, she became restless during the night because of an unconscious wish to entice me to go there, and since I did not come during the night, she renewed the bleedings, as an unfailing means of re-awakening my affection. She bled spontaneously three times, and each

bleeding lasted for four days, which must have some significance. She still owes me details and specific dates.

This was allegedly written a year and two months after Emma's operation (March 1895) and seven months after Freud wrote the "alibi" case history of Irma and the "Dream of Irma's Injection." Emma continued to have relapses and as late as the end of July, 1895, she was still in critical condition. It was this situation which was the accession of Freud's dream as he himself declares. Chronologically, however, it must be asked: is Freud here really discussing the Emma operation with all the intensity of a current experience over a year after the first operation? And are Freud's previously quoted remarks in his letter of January, 1897 telling Fliess he was not responsible for Emma "blood" really written almost a year and a half after the event?

Masson does not challenge that the letter's mentioning Emma all refer to the same Emma, nor does he comment on the peculiar situation that such a long period of time seems to separate these passionate self-justifying letters regarding Emma's condition. My own suspicion is that at least some of the letters are intentionally misdated, and predict that an examination of the true originals will verify the fact.

The case history notes of Emma, allegedly written nine

months after Freud wrote the "Dream of Irma's Injection" qualifies in every regard for an "alibi" case history. Just as Freud stated in the preamble of the "Dream of Irma's Injection" it is obviously intended as a defense, an alibi, a self-exculpation. Even Masson asserts that the case history notes are obviously an attempt to "rationalize the aftermath of the operation, in which Emma nearly bled to death." But is this "aftermath" still present over one year after the operation?

It is further interesting to note that while Freud was rationalizing "Fliess's" operation on Emma, Fliess was continuing to brutalize other patients. Freud was providing arguments that Fliess could use for his other cases as well. While Masson does not place things in proper perspective, and corrupts the chronological significance of what is going on, nonetheless he does inform us of an important fact. In the very time period when Freud is claiming that Emma had bled because of her "hemophilia" another patient of Fliess' also had great difficulties due to one of Fliess' "daring" operations. One year after the operation on Emma, Fliess operated on another woman; when she, too, nearly bled to death Fliess gave Freud's explanation of the matter: it was vicarious bleeding. In Masson's own words:

On March 12, 1896, Fliess probed what was left of her left middle nasal concha,

which had been removed earlier (most likely by Fliess himself). As he was carrying out his examination, she developed massive bleeding, which could only be stopped by a very tight packing. At the same time, tears mixed with blood came pouring out of her right eye. On the night of the 13th she had a bloody discharge from her vagina. Fliess "explained" to her right away that the bleeding was vicarious (Die Blutung wurde sofort als vicariirende angesprochen). Proof: between March 1, 1892, and March 12, 1896, 1472 days had elapsed, that is, 64 times 23, her male period.

Freud's case history notes on Emma of May 4, 1896 indicates that Emma bled as an "unfailing" means of "re-arousing" Freud's affection -- a comment that probably tells us more about Freud than Emma. Apparently the sight of blood could invariably arouse his "affection." It would be interesting to know what German word Freud actually used here - was it "affection" or "desire?" That no one will know without seeing the actual letter. The central point here is that Irma is Emma and in the "Dream of Irma's Injection" Freud further admits that he wanted Emma out of the way and, moreover, reveals that it is a characteristic of

his psychology to have murderous desires for most everyone to whom he was close. It is this linkage that Masson seeks to obscure and deny by asserting that Irma and Emma was not one and the same person. The following specific correlations, between Emma and Irma, conclusively demonstrate that Irma and Emma are one and the same person and that Masson's persuasion to the contrary is mistaken and deluded, if not purposely contrived.

Specific Correlations identifying Emma as Irma

BOTH "Irma" of the "Dream of Irma's Injection" and Emma Eckstein are the same persona and have the following biographical correspondences in common:

1. Had a continuing medical crisis between March, 1895 and July 24, 1895.
2. Diagnosed as a "Sexual Hysteric"
3. Complained of abdominal pains
4. Recalcitrant to Freud's final solution
5. Problem with turbinate bones

6. Freud associates the odor of amyl with guilt concerning the patient.
7. Examined by other doctor friends of Freud's during medical crisis.
8. Suffered serious infections due to Freud's care.
9. Freud "invented" an illness for her
- 10 Freud wanted to hurt her
11. Fears of legal reprisals are uppermost in Freud's mind
12. Freud is worried about the drugs that he gives her
13. Patient turned "pale and puffy"
14. Recollections of the patient are intimately connected with his friend Dr. Fliess and sex hypnotic drugs
15. Needles and pins are prominently associated with Freud's memories of the patient.
16. There was nothing organically wrong with the patient

17. Freud's intention was to cure a sexual problem
18. Freud was very sexually attracted to the patient
19. Freud had a "one sided" interest in the patient and insisted that if the patient did not get well it was her own fault
20. Freud claimed that from her case he had made a great psychological discovery which corroborated Fliess's theories.

If “Irma” and “Emma” were, in fact, two *different patients*, as Masson, without evidence would have us believe—*so* much the worse for Freud. For then we have *yet another victim* to add to Freud's long list which he himself first began in his commentary on the "Dream of Irma's Injection." And so much the worse for Masson's scholarship and detective work which missed this famous entire episode in Freud's life. Indeed, it was an event occurring simultaneously with the “Emma” episode) also involving Freud's examination of one of his own guilt dreams.

The truth is the published editions of Freud's letters are silent on the subject of Freud's historic "penetration" into the meaning of dreams. There are no letters, curiously, in late July or later which directly mentions the event at all, though Freud thought the analysis of his "Dream of

Irma's Injection" to be so important he phantacised a marble plaque dedicated to his discovery being erected in the residence where he first wrote the analysis. It is most difficult to believe that Freud did not communicate any of this self-claimed historic understanding of dreams to Fliess at the time. Freud compulsively sent news of all his discoveries to Fliess. It is strange that there is no comment on this one "accomplishment" which Freud ranked so highly in his professional attainments.

In the foregoing I have provided numerous instances of Masson's corruption of his source materials (numerous more examples could have been cited), and have laid bare his obvious efforts to "correct the effect" of Freud's own words and meanings. In the final analysis, however, Masson's effort is essentially not one of scholarship in any event. It is an issue of The New Freudian Propaganda and its effort to continue to defraud the public of the truth. The real truth that is hidden with the excisions of Freud's letters is that Freud was himself a dangerous public menace with a long list of victims. This is the truth that the New Freudians fear is too horrible for the public to know. Masson's work is itself a scandal contrived to achieve a propagandistic effect. Masson demonstrably uses the same techniques of distortion and text corruption as those employed by his predecessor "authorized" biographers, Jones and Schur. And with the same audacious disregard for the truth characterized by Freud himself and all the other little "Freud's" who

followed him Masson unabashedly asserts that he wanted to correct the public record because:

Nobody it seemed to me had the right to decide for others, by altering the record, what was truth and what was error.

And yet the truth is, Masson gave himself the right to decide for others, by altering the record, what was truth and what was error. Masson, by consistent corruption of the record seeks to dictate the new "truth" that Freud was originally right. So, he excluded discussion of Freud's claims that his own father was a sex pervert, that he was sexually assaulted by his nurse maid at the age of 2 years, and that Freud was himself so mentally disturbed during the period when he created his early theories as to be incapable of producing "scientific evidence" on any subject - especially on any theory involving sexual perversions and child hood incest rape.

By special arrangements with the Freud Archives, Anna Freud, and the Harvard University Press, a new "unexpurgated" edition of the Freud/Fliess correspondence was published in March of 1985. Much in this edition further corroborates the thesis of this work. The question must unavoidably be asked: Is the Harvard University Press, too, a dupe to Freudian propaganda or a fellow co-conspirator in one of the most shameless frauds in modern history?

But far more important than anything we need to deal with concerning the Harvard University Press or Jeffery Masson, is the subject of Freud himself. E.M. Thornton, in her book *The Freudian Fallacy* [i.e. originally, *Freud and Cocaine*] establishes the thesis that Freud was actually suffering from severe cocaine addiction and that his intellectual work was symptomatic of this serious medical condition. Her work adds much valuable information to the subject and goes far to elucidating a whole range of problems met with in the study of Freud. My own work goes to show, nonetheless, that Freud was a murderer and a "mental" and "medical" case long before he became addicted to cocaine. And it is believed this is certainly a central fact without which the study of Freud cannot do. This is not to suggest, however, that we can. In any way, minimize the impact of Freud's cocaine addiction on the development of his work, especially during its critical formative stages, nor on his specific behavior patterns. Thornton's work provides valued and needed support for the fleshing out the portrait of Freud as a demented soul and for a clarification of the cultural waters muddied by a lionization of this madman. Her words should be well heeded that:

The behavioral eccentricities displayed by Freud in the nineties and dismissed by Jones as the harmless peccadilloes of a man of genius must now be given a more

sinister interpretation. Jones' dramatic picture of a tormented genius wrestling with the demons of his unconscious mind actually tells the story of a cocaine addiction following an almost classic course. Freud's rapid mood swings from exalted elation to profound depression, his episodes of clouded consciousness and periods of hyperactivity, interpreted by Jones as the manifestations of a "creative neurosis," are actually specific cocaine effects, as are the mysterious heart symptoms that appeared about the same time. Freud's bitter complaints of ostracism and victimization, which Jones repeats but which later biographers have shown groundless, were the paranoid delusions of persecution peculiar to the later stages of cocaine addiction; his suspicions and bitter denunciations of his disciples arose from the same cause. The unaccountable lapses in memory, the incompatibilities and discrepancies in his works that so taxed his editors and translators were also cocaine effects. Only deliberate mendacity, however, can explain some of these discrepancies, and this too Freud betrayed another symptom of his addiction.

Who could doubt, in view of the evidence now available, that Freud's cocaine addiction seriously exacerbated an already moribund, if not necrotic personality structure, burdened as it was by murder-guilt—a “Cain-complex” as Dr. Max Schur wrote, in addition to an “Oedipal-complex.”

The End

7/4/2009

More evidence of Masson's corruption of Freud's Fliess correspondence and other Freudian propaganda will be further developed in another edition of this essay. elm